

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed June 10, 2005. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-19 are respectfully requested.

1. Present Status of Patent Application

The Office Action mailed June 10, 2005 is silent regarding entry of the amendments to the Specification and Claims submitted in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005. Accordingly, Applicants assume that the amendments submitted in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005 have been entered, no claims are amended herewith.

Furthermore, the Office Action mailed June 10, 2005 is silent with respect to those issues regarding the Specification, Title and Abstract which were raised in the Office Action of January 13, 2005. Accordingly, Applicants believe that their remarks regarding the Specification, Title and Abstract, and the associated amendments, in the response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005 have been considered and are sufficient to overcome those objections.

2. Response to Rejection of Claims 1-12 and 14-19 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 10, 13-14, 24, 27, 30 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable by *Linsker et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,598,473), hereinafter *Linsker*. For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. Section 102, the cited reference must disclose all elements/features/steps of the claim. See, e.g., *E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 USPQ2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

a. Independent Claim 1

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the amended features of independent claim 1. More precisely, with respect to claim 1, *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest a "method of *delivering* and determining the authenticity of a digital document sent by an unknown sender *to an intended recipient at a printout station*" as recited in claim 1. For at least this reason alone,

Linsker does not anticipate claim 1, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "receiving and securely retaining a digital document and a transmitted independently verifiable data record of the intended recipient at a printout station, an encrypted digest of the document created by the sender using a hash algorithm, the digest being encrypted using a first token of the sender" as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 1, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Nor does *Linsker* disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "obtaining a second token relating to the first token of the sender" as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 1, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Nor does *Linsker* disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "obtaining a first token of the intended recipient" as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 1, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Nor does *Linsker* disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "decoding the encrypted digest using the second token of the sender" as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 1, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Nor does *Linsker* disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "requesting proof of the intended recipient's identity at the printout station using data in the independently verifiable data record of the intended recipient" as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 1, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Finally, *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "releasing the document when the intended recipient has proved their identity by use of a second

token that is uniquely related to the first token of the intended recipient" as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 1, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 2-8

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 2-8 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 2-8 contain all features/elements of independent claim 1. See, e.g., *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, the rejection to these claims should be withdrawn.

c. Independent Claim 9

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the amended features of independent claim 9. More precisely, with respect to claim 9, *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest a "method of sending *and delivering* a digital document *to an intended recipient at a printout station* together with data enabling the document and the sender to be authenticated" as recited in claim 9 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 9, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "*obtaining a first token of the intended recipient*" as recited in claim 9 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 9, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Nor does *Linsker* disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "sending the encrypted digest, the digital document and the second token *of the sender* to the recipient" as recited in claim 9 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 9, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Nor does *Linsker* disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of “*receiving and securely retaining a transmitted document and a transmitted independently verifiable data record of the intended recipient at a printout station*” as recited in claim 9 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 9, as amended in the Applicants’ response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Nor does *Linsker* disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of “*requesting proof of the intended recipient's identity at the printout station using data in the independently verifiable data record of the intended recipient*” as recited in claim 9 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 9, as amended in the Applicants’ response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Finally, *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of “*releasing the document when the intended recipient has proved their identity by use of a second token that is uniquely related to the first token of the recipient*” as recited in claim 9 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 9, as amended in the Applicants’ response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

d. Claims 10-12 and 14-17

Because independent claim 9 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 10-12 and 14-17 (which depend from independent claim 9) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 10-12 and 14-17 contain all features/elements of independent claim 9. Accordingly, the rejection to these claims should be withdrawn.

e. Independent Claim 18

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 18, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the amended features of independent claim 18. More precisely, with respect to claim 18, *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest a “*device for delivering and determining the authenticity of a digital document sent by an unknown sender to an intended recipient at a printout station*” as recited in claim 18 (emphasis added). For

at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 18, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "a communications module arranged to receive *an electronic version of the transmitted document over a communications network, an independently verifiable data record of the intended recipient*, a first token of the intended recipient, an encrypted digest of the document created by the sender using a hash algorithm, the digest being encrypted using a first token of the sender, and a second token relating to the first token *of the sender*" as recited in claim 18 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 18, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Nor does *Linsker* disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "*a store for securely retaining the transmitted document, the transmitted independently verifiable data record and the first token of the intended recipient*" as recited in claim 18 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 18, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Nor does *Linsker* disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "*an instruction module for requesting proof of the intended recipient's identity using data provided in the intended recipient's data record*" as recited in claim 18 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 18, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Finally, *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "a controller arranged to decode the encrypted digest using the second token *of the sender*; creating a digest of the document using a hash algorithm; comparing the decrypted received digest with the newly created digest to determine the authenticity of the sender and the document; and *releasing the document when the intended recipient has proved their identity by use of a second token of the intended recipient that is uniquely related to the first token of the intended recipient*" as recited in claim 18 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 18, as amended in the

Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

f. Independent Claim 19

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 19, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the amended features of independent claim 19. More precisely, with respect to claim 19, *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest a "device for *sending and delivering a digital document to an intended recipient at a printout station together with data enabling the document and the sender to be authenticated*" as recited in claim 19 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 19, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "a controller arranged to create a digest of the document using a hash algorithm and to encrypt the digest using a first token of the sender, and *to release the document when the intended recipient has proved their identity by use of a second token of the intended recipient that is uniquely related to the first token of the intended recipient*" as recited in claim 19 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 19, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Nor does *Linsker* disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "*a store for securely retaining the transmitted document, the transmitted independently verifiable data record and the first token of the intended recipient*" as recited in claim 19 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 19, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Nor does *Linsker* disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of "*an instruction module for requesting proof of the intended recipient's identity using data provided in the intended recipient's data record*" as recited in claim 19 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 19, as amended in the Applicants' response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Finally, *Linsker* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of “a communications module arranged to obtain *an electronic version of the transmitted document over a communications network, an independently verifiable data record of the intended recipient, a first token of the intended recipient, a second token of the sender* related to the first token of the sender, which can be used to decrypt the encrypted digest and to send the encrypted digest, the digital document and the second token to the recipient” as recited in claim 19 (emphasis added). For at least this reason alone, *Linsker* does not anticipate claim 19, as amended in the Applicants’ response to the Office Action of January 13, 2005, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

3. Response to Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action of January 13, 2005, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Linsker*, in view of *Clark et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,448,045). Because independent claim 9 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claim 13 (which depends from independent claim 9) is allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claim 13 contains all features/elements of independent claim 9. Accordingly, the rejection to this claim should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Raymond W. Armentrout
Reg. No. 45,866